

The "Unbiased" "Independent"

The Greek Schism and Benedict XV

The Catholic Mind

SEMI-MONTHLY

Price 5 cents; \$1.00 per year

Entered as second-class matter, October 22, 1914, at the Post Office at
New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. XV, No. 9. May 8, 1917

THE AMERICA PRESS

59 East 83d Street

NEW YORK

THE CATHOLIC MIND

1903

What the Church Has Done for Education.
John Conway

1906

The Delusion of Christian Science.
T. J. Campbell

1911

11. *Cardinal Gibbons' Jubilee.*
14. *Protests of Pius X and Bishops of Portugal.*

1912

11. *Marist Missions in the Pacific, II, III.*
Rt. Rev. John J. Grimes, S.M.
13. *The Religious Teacher.* M. J. O'Connor
17. *The People's Pope.* Michael Kenny
24. *Father Algue's Barocyclometer.*
New York Tribune, Dec. 1912

1913

5. *Capital Punishment.* John J. Ford
16. *Catholicism and Americanism.*

1914

15. *Freemasonry and Catholicism in America.* M. Kenny
16. *Divorce.* Hon. Joseph E. Ransdell
19. *Justice to Mexico.*
21. *The Needy Family and Institutions.* R. H. Tierney
22. *The Architect's Plan.* John A. Cotter
23. *Mexican Liberalism.* A. de F.
24. *First Encyclical of Benedict XV.*

1915

1. *The Catholic Press.* E. Hull
2. *The "Menace" and the Mails.* Paul Bakewell
3. *The Ethics of War.* Edward Masterson
5. *The Jesuit Myth.* Robert Swickerath
8. *Was Shakespeare a Catholic?* James J. Walsh, M.D., Ph.D.
10. *Dante's 650th Birthday.* James J. Walsh, M.D., Ph.D.
12. *The Church and the Sex Problem.* R. H. Tierney
13. *The War's Lesson.* Rt. Rev. Thomas O'Dwyer, D.D.
14. *Catholic Schools for Catholic Youths.* Most Rev. John Ireland
17. *The Church and the Immigrant.* Rt. Rev. Francis C. Kelley, D.D.

18. *The Contemporary Drama.* James J. Daly
21. *The Church and Peace.* Most Rev. E. J. Hanna, D.D.
22. *Mexico's Social Problem.* By a Mexican Lawyer
24. *Reading and Character.* James J. Daly

1916

1. *Catholics and Frank Statement.* Ernest R. Hull
4. *The Ethics of Journalism.* Thomas F. Woodlock
6. *South America's Catholicism.* Walter Dwight
7. *Maeterlinck's Philosophy of Life.* Condé Benoist Pallen, LL.D.
8. *The Catholic Sense.* William Power
10. *The Training of the Priest.* Most Rev. E. J. Hanna, D.D.
11. *Thomas M. Mulry.* Francis J. Lamb
12. *"Chiefly Among Women."* Mrs. Margaret F. Sullivan
14. *The Causes of National Success.* Denis Lynch
15. *The Catholic School System.* George Thompson
16. *Dangers of Secular Universities.* F. L.
17. *Father Rodriguez's Tercentenary.* George O'Neill
18. *Pseudo-Scientists vs. Catholics.* F. L.
19. *An Eighteenth-Century Social Work.* Henri Fouqueray
20. *Race Suicide.* M. P. Dowling
22. *Agenics.* M. J. Riordan
23. *Shaw's "Apologetics."* Daniel A. Lord
24. *The Dominicans' Seventh Centenary.* Peter Guilday, Ph.D.

1917

1. *The Church and Science.* Thomas Dwight, M.D., LL.D.
2. *Canada's Language Controversy.* Papal Encyclical
3. *Mexico's "National Church."* Rt. Rev. Ignatius Valdespino
4. *How Catholic Colleges Exist.* Henry S. Spalding, S.J.
5. *The Duties of Catholics.* Rt. Rev. Cornelius Van de Ven, D.D.
6. *Study Centers for Work-Folk.* A. Leleu
7. *Governor Catts' Delusions.* Francis J. Sullivan
The Catholic Church and Billy Sunday. J. Harding Fisher, S.J.
8. *Christianity and the War.* Rt. Rev. John P. Carroll, D.D.

Single numbers 5c. each, \$3 per hundred.

Bind Your Copies of the Catholic Mind; "Little Ben Binder" Only 60c Postpaid

THE AMERICA PRESS, 59 EAST 83D STREET, NEW YORK.

The “Unbiased” “Independent”

*The Correspondence between Mr. Hamilton Holt and
Mr. Thomas F. Woodlock Regarding the “Independent’s” Editorial on “The Elimination of Religion and Education from Mexico.”*

IN its issue dated March 26, 1917, the *Independent* published the following editorial article under the caption “The Elimination of Religion and Education from Mexico”:

The Mexican constitution which was promulgated February 5, 1917, and is printed in translation by *The Mexican Review* of Washington, is a most amazing document. It appears that the reactionary party is in full control and are determined to prevent any light from the outside world penetrating the darkness of Mexico, and to preclude the possibility of the Mexican people developing a free and enlightened civilization for themselves.

Americans of all classes are desirous of aiding in the regeneration of Mexico, not by conquest or intervention, but by establishing there free schools, free press and free churches such as have formed the character of our own country, and such as Mexico needs more than anything else in the world. Scores of devoted and qualified young men and women are ready to enter this field. Millions of Americans have contributed money to this cause. Our universities are anxious to assist. Several organizations have been formed to start educational institutions of various kinds, elementary, higher, technical and normal, religious or secular. Never has there been such a generous proffer of good will and practical aid from one people to another.

But the new Mexican constitution is drawn up with diabolical cunning to frustrate and impede all such efforts and to keep the people in ignorance and superstition. Even Dr. Francia, auto-

crat of Paraguay, dared not assume such tyranny over the acts and consciences of his subjects.

We have space here to consider the effect of a few of the provisions of this obscurantist instrument:

Every religious act of public worship shall be performed strictly within the places of public worship which shall be at all times under governmental supervision.

This would prevent such religious services as household prayer meetings and Sunday schools and the development of new churches. No nonconformist or reformation movement could ever arise in Mexico if this provision is enforced. For all "places of worship" that now exist or shall hereafter be erected are "the property of the nation" and the Department of the Interior decides whether any such places of public worship are needed, and, if so, what sort of services shall be conducted in them and what the minister may say and do. For one thing, the minister is absolutely prohibited from exercising his highest function, that of influence on public affairs:

No ministers of religious creeds shall, either in public or private meetings, or in acts of worship or religious propaganda, criticize the fundamental laws of the country, the authorities in particular or the government in general; they shall have no vote, nor be eligible to office, nor shall they be entitled to assemble for political purposes.

Every kind of political association whose name shall bear any word or any indication relating to any religious belief is hereby strictly forbidden. No assemblies of any political character shall be held within places of public worship.

That is to say, such political preachers as Isaiah and Jeremiah, John and Jesus, Paul and Peter, Augustine and Savonarola, Knox and Calvin, Wesley and Edwards are not allowed in Mexico! They might expose some of the rottenness of Mexican politics and some of the evil in high places.

Only a Mexican by birth may be a minister of any religious creed in Mexico.

America rejoices that she has been able to call from abroad such able ministers as Whitefield and McCosh, Jowett, Aked and Hugh Black, but they would not be allowed in Mexico.

The state legislatures shall have the exclusive power of determining the maximum number of ministers of religious creeds according to the needs of each locality.

Think of giving our State legislatures such power! Yet we believe they will compare favorably with the Mexican in honesty and intelligence.

The press as well as the pulpit is to be muzzled in Mexico:

No periodical publication which either by reason of its program, its title or merely by its general tendencies, is of a religious character, shall comment upon any political affairs of the nation, nor publish any information regarding the acts of the authorities of the country or of private individuals in so far as the latter have to do with public affairs.

If this had been the law in the United States such periodicals as *The Independent* and *The Outlook* would never have been started and the religious press of the country would be deprived of its influence on public affairs.

No religious denomination, no minister or ex-minister, is allowed to found or to conduct schools, colleges, universities, technical institutions, research laboratories, hospitals, orphan asylums, charitable institutions or anything else of the kind. But at least nine-tenths of the higher educational and the charitable institutions of the United States were founded under religious auspices. If this had been our constitution we should have been deprived of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, St. Luke's and the Presbyterian hospitals, the Protestant, Catholic and Hebrew orphanages, and all similar institutions of incalculable benefit to our country. Russia could not do worse than Mexico under the new régime.

Finally, to make the power of the bureaucracy absolute and to extinguish all possibility of popular control, it is expressly provided that

No trial by jury shall ever be granted for the infraction of any of the preceding provisions.

We understand fully the conditions that have given rise to the fanatical anti-clericalism which finds expression in this constitution. It is an intolerance generated by intolerance. It is tyranny evoked by tyranny. The Roman Catholic Church has had supreme control over the people of Mexico for four hundred years and cannot escape the responsibility for their ignorance, superstition and poverty. But the way to reform a church is not to make it subservient to the state. That makes it worse. The

only way to combat intolerance is by tolerance. The only thing that can conquer tyranny is freedom. With free schools, free churches and free press there would be great hope for the future of Mexico. But the new constitution, altho it contains many enlightened provisions, would strangle the only agencies capable of reforming Mexico.

I called (verbally) Mr. Holt's attention to the gross misstatement of the case in the concluding passage of this editorial, and I wrote to another gentleman connected with the *Independent* to the same effect. On March 30 I received the following letter from Mr. Holt:

March 29

"My dear Mr. Woodlock:

Ever since you spoke to me at the . . . the other day in regard to that editorial that we printed on the Catholic Church, I have been meaning to write you. But a letter has just come from . . . enclosing your letter to him of March 22, and I take the opportunity of inviting you to write a short letter controverting anything in that editorial that you wish to, which we should be glad to print in our department of Independent Opinions. It must not be over 300 words in length. I am surprised that you have picked out the last sentence of our editorial for adverse criticism and overlooked the fact that the entire editorial was written in defense of the Catholic as well as other churches, against the tyrannical intolerance manifested by the present Mexican Government. I have seen no stronger editorial than that anywhere in defense of religious liberty. I must confess, however, that my trip to Mexico convinced me that the Catholic Church there had been seriously at fault in adopting such a reactionary attitude and in failing to do

what it could to elevate the masses. This was perfectly obvious, it seems to me, to anyone visiting Mexico and it was confirmed by almost every Mexican and American, including Catholics, with whom I spoke.

Very truly yours

HAMILTON HOLT"

To which letter I replied as follows:

"My dear Mr. Holt:

March 31, 1917.

I thank you for your letter of March 29 in which you invite me to write a letter of 300 words to the *Independent* controverting your editorial of March 26. In declining this invitation I think it fair to tell you why I do so. The offending passage in your editorial was as follows:

We understand fully the conditions that have given rise to the fanatical anti-clericalism which finds expression in this constitution. It is an intolerance generated by intolerance. It is a tyranny evoked by tyranny. The Roman Catholic Church has had supreme control over the people of Mexico for four hundred years and cannot escape responsibility for their ignorance, superstition and poverty.

You expect me in 300 words, or in 3,000 words, or 30,000 words!—to deal with a generalization of this sort covering 400 years in the life of a nation, to answer an indictment drawn in such terms! Why the only comment that is fit to make upon it is that no one who was accustomed to the accurate use of words and possessed even an elementary knowledge of the facts could in his senses make such a statement! That ignorance so astounding, so comprehensive and so complete could exist on the part of anyone thought to be a fit and proper person to write for the *Independent*, and with regard to a country so close to ours as is Mexico, is to me absolutely unaccount-

able—especially after the last four years. I could account for such a statement being made by an illiterate and prejudiced Protestant missionary reporting to the American Board or the Student Volunteers or any other organization of that type. But not by an editorial writer in the *Independent*. Had you *nobody* in your office who knew something about the people who *did* control Mexico in the last hundred years and especially the last fifty years? Had you *no one* who understands the nature of the so-called 'anti-clerical' in Latin countries and his 'ancestry'?

Do you really mean me to understand that your 'trip to Mexico' enables you to underwrite the *Independent's* indictment? Surely not!

It is true that the *Independent's* editorial by *implication* favors freedom of religious worship in Mexico. But no one who did not know would guess from it that 98 per cent of the Mexican people are debarred by the Constitution from the free practice of their own religion, the only religion they will ever have. It seems to me that the barring of foreign missionaries is a small thing compared to that infraction of 'religious liberty'. Would the *Independent* have been quite so vehement if the Catholic religion only had been thus abridged? There is nothing in the article by which you can prove that it would. The grievance seems to be mainly that others cannot come in. Yet the *real* wrong of the Constitution, the *real* crime against liberty committed by it, the crime that should make every American hot with indignation, is that the people of Mexico are hindered from the free exercise of their *own* religious worship. And I have yet to see *this* crime reprobated as it should be in a secular paper in America.

The *Independent* aims at being used in schools as a kind of text-book of current events. I find that a number of our schools and academies do use it. Doubtless many others do so. Knowing this the editors should be extraordinarily careful in the use of words and in their generalizations. Yet, as you know, I have had occasion many times in the last twenty years to protest its utterances. In fact, whenever I buy a copy of either the *Independent* or the *Outlook*, I always ask myself the question: 'What piece of bad logic, bad scholarship, bad history, or bad manners am I going to find this time?' Not so very long ago I was obliged to rebuke a particularly flagrant offense of this kind in the *Outlook*—which, it is only fair to say, has averaged a greater number of such than the *Independent*, and in spite of the fact that I convicted it of a glaring misstatement quite inexcusable in character I failed to secure a proper retraction or even apology.

I am tired—or almost tired—of trying to overtake things of this kind. It is almost a hopeless job, at best, even when the statements are very much less sweeping than this one and I am not limited to 300 words in reply.

But would you blame me or consider me unfair if I publicly warned all our schools, colleges and academies against the *Independent* as a text-book of 'Current Events', and took this very article as my text? If so—on what grounds? Why is it not my duty to do so?

I have no desire to engage you or Mr. . . . in a correspondence on this matter. There really is not anything more for either of us to say about it, and the questions I ask you are 'rhetorical' in the sense that I don't expect you to answer them. But I would like you to realize the fact that you, *i. e.* the *Independent* are *partisan*

just as *I* am partisan; you are not impartial on the subject and no one is. Your paper has inherited the 'evangelical' viewpoint on all these things. There is no such thing as non-partisan in religious matters. The 'agnostic' so-called is 'sectarian' as much as is a Methodist or a Baptist or a Jew or any other denomination. I don't ask you therefore to be impartial. But I have a right to ask you to be *accurate* and *fair*. I have no doubt that you mean to be fair, but the intention is of no value without accuracy. Believe me, however,

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS F. WOODLOCK."

On April 6 I received the following letter in reply:

April 5, 1917.

"My dear Mr. Woodlock:

I am sorry that you refuse to write 300 words in reply to the last sentence in our editorial, though I was very glad to receive your letter which was many times 300 words in length. The space we offered you was ample to make any general denial of our statement because it is seven times longer than the charges made. If we let you have an article or two on the subject that would mean that we would have to have another article on the other side, and that means a controversy at this time when the world is going into war and that would not interest, in my judgment, the vast majority of our readers.

The editorial did apply chiefly to the infraction of the rights of the Mexican Catholics in Mexico because they constitute 98 per cent. of the Mexican people. We did not think it necessary to make any distinction between Catholics and Protestants because we supposed that

everyone knew that Mexico is a Catholic country. I am still very much surprised that you think our editorial was entirely anti-Catholic because the purpose behind it was to show that the Mexicans were very unfair to all the Catholics, and we simply put the last sentence in to show that we understood the reasons for it though we did not palliate them. As for your statement in regard to the *Independent* in schools, I think you will find it very difficult to find any magazine or periodical more unbiased on the religious or any other question, or in general more well-informed. We cannot at any rate avoid the expression of personal opinions right along. That is the chief purpose of the *Independent*, and if the schools don't want opinions in their classes, they will have to confine themselves to text-books.

Very truly yours,
HAMILTON HOLT,
Editor."

Upon this I wrote to Mr. Holt asking his permission to publish this correspondence, and received his consent in the letter which follows:

"My dear Mr. Woodlock:

I have your letter of April 6. There is nothing in the two previous letters that I am unwilling to print, but I should prefer not to extend the controversy because your objection is mostly due to a misunderstanding of the meaning and purpose of the editorial which was written as a protest against the intolerant and anti-clerical spirit of the Carranza Government of which the Mexican Catholics are obviously the chief sufferers. If then, I should consent to your publication of my former letters,

it would be only on condition that you print them together with this one and with the editorial *in full*.

Very truly yours,

HAMILTON HOLT,
Editor.

P. S. I have had a copy of your letter of March 31 made which I herewith return to you."

I think it is unnecessary to comment upon the foregoing further than to invite attention to the *Independent's* curious way of defending the rights of Mexican Catholics to the free exercise of their religion, as referred to in Mr. Holt's letter of April 5. It is amazingly illuminating as to the mental attitude of mind that characterizes a great many people in America upon this Mexican question.

I may add that for some time past I have been endeavoring to induce the New York *Evening Post* (which undertook last December to tell the world the "Truth about Mexico") to tell its readers something about the new Mexican Constitution and the kind of religious "liberty" it gives to the people of Mexico. My efforts have been unavailing up to this time.

As it is only fifteen millions of Catholics who are concerned, doubtless the matter is of no concern!

THOMAS F. WOODLOCK.

The Greek Schism and Benedict XV

GEORGE CALAVASSY.

Reprinted from the "Catholic World."

IT may seem strange at first sight, at this time of crisis in the world's history, to speak of the Greek Schism, and even to present it as a live issue, and to connect with it the name of our Holy Father, Pope Benedict XV. It will seem especially strange to those who do not realize what religious and social questions must be answered in the near future. This is precisely the time to consider certain problems, the solution of which is of the utmost importance in view of the great mission which awaits Christianity after this gigantic struggle of nations and peoples. Benedict XV., upon whose shoulders weighs the enormous burden of responsibility for the interests of the Church and Christianity, is more than anyone else preoccupied with these problems, among which the return to unity of the Greek Church with its more than one hundred millions of adherents is of very great importance.

For some time past there has been wide discussion about Christian unity. As a result the Pope has at times been credited with intentions which have not received the slightest official confirmation. Although officially sent from Rome to preach in favor of a work which has for its precise object the conversion of the Schismatic Greeks, the writer of this article is not, however, authorized to make the slightest official declaration concerning the union of the Churches. . . .

It is impossible, of course, to cover here the history of the early Greek Church. Suffice it to say that controversies, misunderstandings, political jealousies and subsequently the superiority of Greek over Latin civilization, and the fact that since the time of Constantine the Great, Constantinople had become the capital of the Empire, the difficulty of Rome's exercising control owing to distance and the difficulties of communication, all went towards facilitating this unfortunate schism. Ambitious, self-seeking, hypocritical men fanned these flames, and one stood out prominently as their leader. This man, Photius, was endowed with unusual intellectual ability, he was a distinguished scholar, canonist, theologian and poet. To gifts of mind he joined distinction of birth which enabled him to rank among the favorites of the imperial court and to fill most important offices. But his craftiness and ambition got the upper hand of his good qualities. Hence when the opportunity presented itself, he did not hesitate to trample under foot both the canon law and all respect for the rights of others.

There was at that time on the patriarchal throne of Constantine a saintly bishop named Ignatius. Following the example of his great and holy predecessors, who did not hesitate to reproach the Emperors and the courtiers with their crimes and their scandals, Ignatius publicly refused Communion to the tutor of the Emperor Michael III., Cæsar Bardas, who gave public scandal by taking to wife his son's widow. The Patriarch's act, which was worthy of a Catholic bishop, drew upon him the false accusation of conspiring against the Empire, and consequently he was deposed and sent into exile in 859. Photius was the intimate friend of Bardas, and through the latter's intrigues was appointed to the patriarchal

throne to succeed Ignatius. Photius was only a layman, despite which fact he was made Patriarch within six days. Hence he was doubly guilty, first, of having usurped the throne of the legitimate patriarch, and, secondly, for having passed through all orders leading to the episcopate within six days, against the rulings of canon law. The matter was, therefore, very serious, and could not but attract the attention and condemnation of the Bishop of Rome, the supreme head of the Church. It became necessary, therefore, to forestall Papal intervention, and, not having succeeded in wresting an abdication from Ignatius, Photius wrote to Pope Nicholas I., announcing his election, but keeping silence about its uncanonical proceedings and pretending to have been forced in spite of himself to accept the election. Some time later several bishops met in synod, and at the command of the court pronounced Ignatius deposed, and then confirmed the election of Photius.

The Pope having learned the whole truth deposed and excommunicated Photius and reestablished Ignatius on his throne. Photius had either to submit or declare a revolt. His ambition urged him to the latter course, and being upheld in it by the Emperor he assembled a synod in 867, before which he laid a number of accusations against the Latin Church, thus changing the personal question into a doctrinal and disciplinary controversy between the two Churches. The synod accepted his accusations, excommunicated the Pope, and declared all communication with Rome broken off.

So the schism was accomplished, but Photius was not to enjoy long the fruits of his disastrous intrigue. Less than a year later the Emperor Michael was put to death. His successor, Basil the Macedonian, deposed and exiled

Photius and restored Ignatius to the throne. Ignatius immediately renewed the bonds between his Church and the Church of Rome. Two years later the eighth General Council assembled at Constantinople under the presidency of the legates of Pope Adrian II, confirmed the guilt and excommunication of Photius, recognized Ignatius as the legitimate Patriarch of Constantinople and solemnly proclaimed the primacy of the Pope.

Photius, however, succeeded once more in winning the favor of Basil, and at the death of Ignatius he was again placed on the patriarchal throne. Scarcely was he in power when he renewed his attacks against the Papacy and the Church of Rome, but Leo VI, the Philosopher, the son and successor of Basil I, was deeply distrustful of Photius, his former master, and as soon as he was Emperor he hastened to depose him. This time Photius died without being able to regain the throne for the third time. By the death of Photius, union was completely restored between Rome and Constantinople and lasted for a century and a half, but the bad seed sown by him was unfortunately destined to bear fruit.

During the one hundred and fifty years of union which succeeded the Photian schism, relations between Rome and Constantinople were not always very close. A certain antagonism in political and disciplinary matters; reproaches sometimes uttered in rather sharp language on one side or the other; the coldness caused by the intervention of both sides in the conversion of the Bulgars; and other regrettable incidents kept alive among the Greeks the embers of revolt. Only a daring leader was needed to rekindle the conflagration. Such a leader was Michael Cærularius.

Vastly inferior to Photius in mind and talents, Cærul-

arius surpassed him in pride, in daring and in brutal energy. Having been sentenced to prison for conspiring against the Emperor Michael IV, he decided to enter a monastery. Two years later Constantine Monomachos ascended the throne. He had taken part with Cærularius in the conspiracy against Emperor Michael IV. A year later, when the patriarchal throne was vacant, the Emperor elevated to it Michael Cærularius.

As Patriarch he at once sought to be independent of all authority, and began a desperate war against the Pope and the Latin Church. By letters to bishops and all kinds of publications, he endeavored to convince them that it was necessary to break with a Church which dared to use unleavened bread in the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice and which imposed the Sabbath fast. Accusations and calumnies were succeeded by violent persecution of the Latin churches and the Faithful in Constantinople.

When Pope Leo IX was informed of these serious proceedings, he wrote at once to Michael Cærularius in a firm but moderate tone, reproaching him with his conduct towards the Latins in contrast to the magnanimity and condescension of Rome towards the Greeks living in Italy and elsewhere. If this letter abated for a time the Patriarch's fury, probably for political reasons, it did not shake his resolution to attain his end. Hence the Pope was obliged to send three legates to Constantinople to deal with the matter at close range and, if necessary, to take more energetic measures. He confided to them two letters, one for the Emperor and the other for the Patriarch. The Emperor was won over to the side of peace, but nothing was of any avail as far as Cærularius was concerned. All the efforts of the Emperor and the legates

were in vain; nothing could overcome the obstinacy of the Patriarch, blinded by ambition and pride. He even redoubled his efforts to win over the Bishops and Patriarchs to the side of his rebellion by lies and incredible calumnies, and later refused to deal further with the legates.

The latter, seeing that all their efforts were in vain, decided to use severity; therefore, in the year 1054 during a solemn service in St. Sofia, they declared the Patriarch and his adherents excommunicated, adding that this act implied no intention of condemning the Greek Church, whose faith retained its integrity.

After the departure of the legates, which took place immediately after the publication of the excommunication, the excommunicated Patriarch assembled some metropolitans in synod and issued a so-called synodal letter to all the Bishops and Patriarchs, in which he declared the legates responsible for the separation because they had attacked and calumniated the Greek Church, and had placed the Patriarch under the necessity of excommunicating them together with all the Latins.

Having rejected the supreme authority instituted by Jesus Christ in His Church, and having subjected to himself the other Bishops and Patriarchs of the East, Cærularius attempted to supersede the Emperors and impose his will on them in the government of the Empire. At times he succeeded; but when he had set on foot a project to bring about the deposition of the Emperor Isaac Comnenus, as he had that of his predecessor, he was suddenly seized and sent into exile where he died. He had prepared well the ground for schism, and now it was able to put forth such roots that the efforts of ten centuries have not sufficed to destroy it.

Unfortunate circumstances which followed the separation established still more firmly the foundations on which the authors and propagators of the schism built their house. Among the accusations against the Catholic Church which they carefully published among the people, were some which not only bred distrust of Rome's intentions, but aroused hatred of her and kept that hatred alive. Thenceforth the Faithful beheld in her only an enemy who wanted to destroy all that they held most sacred, their rite, their liturgical customs, their language and their nationality. This hatred and distrust of the Catholic Church which has been kept alive in the minds of the people by unremitting efforts on the part of the schismatic authorities, has been handed down from generation to generation. Unhappily there have been Catholics who, through excessive zeal, have confirmed the Greeks in their erroneous opinions. Such undoubtedly was the effect which the Crusades produced among the Greeks. The indescribable conduct of the Crusaders towards the Greek people, the profanation of their churches and monasteries, the usurpation of the imperial throne, the tyranny exercised over the Greeks during the fifty-six years of Latin domination, the intolerance of their rite and their religious customs, are circumstances which have furnished the friends of the schism with strong arguments to keep the Greeks fixed in their hostile attitude towards the Catholic Church. Unquestionably neither the Pope nor the Church had any part in these abuses, which they condemned and reprobated, but the Greeks were not given to making distinctions. Their enemies were Latins; now, the head of the Latins was the Pope; therefore, it was he who wished to destroy their rite and their nation.

The conduct of some European missionaries has con-

firmed them in their false reasoning. Such missionaries, in their zeal to win the Greeks to unity, have forced all who, in good faith, wished to be converted, to renounce their rite, in opposition to Rome's wish in the matter, explicitly expressed time and time again. They were thus able to secure individuals here and there to increase the groups of Latin Catholics formed in different places by the Venetians and Genoese, but to the detriment of the general cause of union, for in the eye of the Greeks these conversions were a proof that the Church of Rome despised their particular customs and was making every effort to do away with them. This state of things lasted until the last century, we may say, until the time of Leo XIII, who, in order to curb the imprudent zeal of the Latin missionaries, promulgated, in his famous letter, *Orientalium dignitas*, several laws against this system of Latinization among the Orientals. Among others, he declared that "any Latin missionary, whether of the secular or of the regular clergy, who obliges or assists an Oriental to pass to the Latin Rite, will not only incur *ipso facto* the suspension of his priestly functions and the other penalties inflicted by the Constitution *Demandatam* (of Benedict XIV), but will furthermore be deprived of and expelled from his post."

Since the consummation of the schism under Cærularius, the Greek Church has remained completely separated from the Catholic Church. It is true that union was twice officially established, once at the Council of Lyons under the Emperor Michael Palæologus in 1274, and again at the Council of Florence under John Palæologus in 1434, but these unions were only ephemeral, because they were inspired by political expediency, and at a time when the ground had not been prepared for the continu-

ance of the union. Nevertheless, the decree of the union, especially at the Council of Florence where the Greek Church was fully represented and where lengthy discussions had preceded the decree, demonstrated that there really existed no dogmatic differences between the two Churches, and that the schism was only due to the spirit of independence of several patriarchs, and to the misunderstandings and prejudices engendered and nourished by a series of deplorable circumstances.

If to the foregoing causes we add ignorance and politics, we shall have summed up the causes which sustain the Greek Schism even to our own day. Dogmatic questions, it is true, are still being agitated among the theologians, but they are questions to which the people are absolute strangers. If the heads of each nation were convinced that the existence of a national Church separated from Rome is not necessary for the realization of their national aspirations, or that in union with Rome they would find a stronger support, all theological differences would immediately disappear.

The Greek Church of today with its one hundred and ten or more millions of adherents, is divided into several autocephalous and independent Churches, such as the Russian Church, the Church of the Kingdom of Greece, the Church of Cyprus, the Bulgarian, Rumanian, Serbian and Montenegrin Churches, and the Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. With the exception of the Patriarchates, all the other national Churches are governed by a synod under the control of the Government and independent of every other Church, so that every Church is so closely connected with the State that it serves as the most powerful instrument of the State for the preservation of national traditions

and the realization of its aspirations. Inasmuch as the aspirations of all these States, and consequently of all these national Churches, are extremely opposed to one another and continually in conflict with one another, it will be readily understood that it would be too much to expect the return to unity of the whole Greek Church in a body. Having no directive union among themselves, and having opposite interests by the very fact of their national Churches, it is impossible that they should agree among themselves in order to reach a common conclusion.

But may it not be hoped that everyone of these Churches will accept the union by itself? It is earnestly to be hoped for; and it is most probable that the example of one would cause the others to follow it. But the question is very complex, because it is mixed up with politics, as I said above, and it would be a difficult and delicate matter to analyze it at this time. Very much depends on the result of the war. Naturally the Catholic Church cannot look for a return to unity that shall have no motives other than political interests; in order to be permanent, the union must be sincere and founded on supernatural motives. Nevertheless, it is certain that his Holiness, Benedict XV, ardently desires to bring back all the Churches to unity, and very probably the commission of which I spoke at the beginning will be charged with studying what can be done toward this end.

Meanwhile, since the conversion of the schismatics is chiefly the work of the grace of God, the Pope first of all invites the Faithful to solicit this grace by prayer. The Pope himself composed and published a few months ago the following prayer for the return of the Eastern Churches to Catholic unity:

O Lord, who hast united the different nations in the confession of Thy name, we pray Thee for the Christian peoples of the East. Mindful of the noble place which they held in Thy Church, we beseech Thee to inspire in them the desire to take it again, in order to form one fold under the rule of one and the same Shepherd. Bring it about that they, together with us, may be filled with the teaching of their holy Doctors, who are also our Fathers in the Faith. Prevent any mishappening which might alienate them still more from us. May the spirit of concord and love, which is a proof of Thy presence among the Faithful, hasten the day when our prayers and theirs may be united in order that every people and every tongue may recognize and glorify Our Lord, Jesus Christ, Thy Son. Amen.

Moreover, his Holiness has decided to put in practice the method which long experience has shown to be most efficacious. This method is the development of the Catholic communities of the Greek Rite already existing, and the establishment of as many new ones as possible.

We have already said that the chief reasons which keep the schismatic peoples still separated from the Catholic Church, are ignorance and prejudice in religious matters. Attachment to their particular rite, liturgical customs and language is so strong in all these Greek Churches that no consideration would induce them to renounce them. Now as a general thing they do not know the Catholic Church except through the presence of foreign missionaries of the Latin Rite and through the Churches of the same rite. Hence in their eyes to become a Catholic means a renunciation of all that they hold most sacred, and therefore they do not so much as consider the question. It must be shown to them, therefore, that this view of the case is not true, and that in becoming Catholics they need make none of these changes. But in order to accomplish this it is absolutely necessary to provide native mission-

aries of the Greek Rite and to form Catholic communities of this rite. . . .

This method was included in Leo XIII's plan for the conversion of the Greeks, but he did not have time to put it completely into practice. In the hope, however, of seeing some result before his death, he sent to Constantinople the French Assumptionist Fathers, with permission to use the Greek Rite and to form there a Greek Catholic community. The priests set forth, full of zeal and abnegation, but they were confronted by another obstacle, which must absolutely be taken into consideration, namely, national sensitiveness. Beneath the habit which these Fathers wore, and the Greek Rite which they practised, the Greeks recognized French missionaries, and, as they thought, disguised, which only confirmed them in their century-long suspicions. This showed the necessity of Greek priests for the Greeks, Bulgarian priests for the Bulgarians, and so forth. So a few years later a little community of Greek Catholic missionaries of the Greek Rite was formed at Constantinople in dependence upon Propaganda. Their work was immediately crowned with success to the great disappointment of the schismatic Patriarch, who bestirred himself to halt the conversions by means of excommunications and unworthy measures against the Greek Catholic missionaries, and against those who had recourse to them with the desire of becoming Catholics. Despite these persecutions, the conversions continued to increase to such an extent that Rome considered it time to send this growing community its first bishop, and on the thirtieth of November, 1911, Pope Pius X appointed the Rt. Rev. Isaias Papadopoulos the first Catholic Bishop of the Greek Rite at Constantinople since the time of Caerularius. . . .

Meanwhile, the result already obtained and the conversions which continue to the present time, have induced the Holy Father to take the first step at Constantinople itself, the very center of the schism. It is quite natural that salvation should come from the very place where the schism originated. Benedict XV, therefore, wishes to develop this work as much as possible, at the same time studying other means from which further results may be hoped for. Thus Constantinople will become the center for subsequent work in other cities of the Ottoman Empire and in other countries.

In the interval, Bishop Papadopoulos is already in the eyes of the Greek people the representative of the Catholic Church, the one with whom they must range themselves if they wish to repudiate the schismatic authorities. Hence he must have a cathedral worthy of the cause which he represents, a cathedral which will be in the eyes of the Greeks a palpable proof of the veneration in which the Catholic Church holds their magnificent rite and their sublime liturgy, which were instituted by the holy Fathers of the Church in the early ages. Hitherto Bishop Papadopoulos has had only a little chapel, long since inadequate for the converted Faithful and for the number of schismatics who resort to it to behold with astonishment how their rite and liturgy are celebrated in their own tongue in a Catholic church, and, what to them is still more astonishing, by Greek priests of their own nationality. . . .

Needless to say, the support which the Holy Father wishes to afford this most important work cannot consist solely in the building of a cathedral. He wishes to provide it with all the means necessary to its development and extension. Now, "the harvest is great but the laborers are few." Hence missionaries must be assured to it by

the foundation of a seminary. A great many priests are necessary, not only for the task of individual conversions, but also in the event of the conversion of the Greeks in a body. The Greek Faithful are ignorant in religious matters, because as a general thing their priests are pitifully ignorant; in the villages especially, the priests are merely peasants scarcely able to read and write. Hence there must be a large number of educated priests, capable of restoring the spirit of faith among both the clergy and the Faithful, of familiarizing them with the chief mysteries of our holy religion, and of destroying their superstitions, the inevitable fruit of ignorance. Otherwise corporate union would be of short duration, for it would not be founded on conviction.

But above all it is essential to provide for future generations by training up the young people in the Catholic faith and spirit, therefore schools must be provided for boys and girls. A Catholic mission or community without schools cannot long endure. . . .

The readers of the *CATHOLIC MIND* have certainly seen in previous publications that in these difficult times our Holy Father relies on the generosity of the Catholics of America for the realization of his plan in behalf of the Greek missions. The zeal of American Catholics and their veneration for the supreme authority of the Church are too well known to require any stimulation in the accomplishment of their duty.

The work is of high importance and of general interest, and unquestionably no Catholic can remain indifferent to it; so that if God blesses the efforts that are being made, all may rejoice to have contributed to some extent, at least by their prayers, to the triumph of Christ's Church in the return to her bosom of so many millions of souls, so long astray.

New Prices for These Books

PIONEER PRIESTS OF NORTH AMERICA

By T. J. CAMPBELL, S.J.

Volume I Among the Iroquois

AN INTERESTING STORY OF THE
MISSIONARIES AMONG THE
IROQUOIS

333 Pages, 27 Illustrations
Price \$1.50, Postage extra

Volume II Among the Hurons

TELLS THE HEROIC STORY OF DE
BRÉBEUF AND HIS ASSO-
CIATES

480 Pages, 24 Illustrations
Price \$1.50, Postage extra

Volume III Among the Algonquins

THE ETHNIC GROUP THAT
FIGURED MORE THAN ANY
OTHER INDIAN FAMILY

336 Pages, 22 Illustrations
Price \$1.50; Postage extra

All three volumes together for \$4.25

PIONEER LAYMEN OF NORTH AMERICA

A New Historical Study by T. J. Campbell, S.J.

Telling the fascinating story of the adventurous Cartier, Menendez, Champlain, De La Tour, Maisonneuve, Le Moyne, Radisson, Le Moyne de Longueuil, Perrot, Le Moyne d'Iberville, Frontenac, La Salle, Le Moyne de Bienville, De La Vérendrye, and Dr. John McLoughlin.

Volume I, 300 Pages, 16 Illustrations. Price \$1.75. Postage extra.
Volume II, 340 Pages, 14 Illustrations. Price, \$1.75. Postage extra.

These Two Splendid Volumes for \$3.00. Postage extra.

LORETO

Annals of
the Century

A Book of Historical Interest
By ANNA C. MINOGUE

Introduction by the
Most Rev. John J. Glennon, D.D.
Archbishop of St. Louis

A fascinating narrative of the accomplishments of the pioneer Catholic women of Kentucky.

300 Pages, 21 Illustrations
Price 50c., Postage extra

ISAAC JOGUES

DISCOVERER OF LAKE GEORGE
By T. J. CAMPBELL, S.J.
55 PAGES, 9 ILLUSTRATIONS.
Leatherette, 25c; green silk cord, gilt top, deckled edge, 50c;
edition de luxe, full flexible green cowhide, stamped with gold, gilt top, deckled edge, \$1.00.
Postage extra.

THE NAMES OF GOD

AND

Meditative Summaries of the Divine Perfection

By the Venerable Leonard Lessius, S.J.
Translated by T. J. CAMPBELL, S.J.

Although written three hundred years ago this book has never before been translated into English.
248 Pages, large type, with Portrait. Price 50c.
Postage extra.

Life of Venerable
Philippine Duchesne

Founder of the
American Mission
of the daughters
of the Sacred
Heart, one of the
intrepid pioneers
in the winning of
the West to the
Faith. Cloth.
25c. Postage extra

Socialism

A Volume of Ten Excellent Essays by Foremost Catholic Writers. All Written in a Concise and Popular Style.

280 Pages

Of special service to those who are interested in the great issue of the day. Price 50c., Postage extra.

The Church and Social Problems

Creating Widespread Discussion
By JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J.
Associate Editor of AMERICA

A valuable handbook for those wishing to know the reasons why Socialism is antagonistic to the principles of Christianity and good citizenship.
Price \$1.00, Postage extra.

THE AMERICA PRESS, 59 East 83rd Street, New York

Every Educated Catholic
Should Subscribe for

A M E R I C A

A Catholic Review of the Week

The National Catholic Weekly

EDITED by Fathers of the Society of Jesus, it chronicles the important events of the day throughout the world, discusses topics of current interest from the Catholic point of view, contains book reviews and has separate departments for education and sociology. Invaluable for priests, lawyers, doctors, teachers and professional men of every class.

RICHARD H. TIERNEY, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

JOSEPH HUSSLEIN	J. HARDING FISHER
WALTER DWIGHT	JOHN C. REVILLE
PAUL L. BLAKELY	

Sample copy on request

10 cents a copy; \$3.00 a year

Canada, \$3.50

Elsewhere, \$4.00

THE AMERICA PRESS

50 East 83d Street

New York